UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,980	01/12/2001	George A. Te	FIS920000303US1	2463

7590 05/03/2005

Connolly, Bove, Lodge & Hutz
Suite 800
1990 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-3425

EXAMINER	
LAZARO, DAVID R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/758,980	TE, GEORGE A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Lazaro	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 November 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,10-17,19 and 20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,10-17,19 and 20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed 11/01/04.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 17 and 19 were amended.

3. Claims 2, 8, 9 and 18 were canceled.

4. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-17, 19 and 20 are pending in this office action.

Response to Amendment

5. The objection to the specification still stands.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/01/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Specification

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a. On page 7, line 23, "sent" should be "send".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

8. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In step (g), "to for" is unclear. The examiner believes it was intended to be "to form" and will interpret it as such. Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: In step (f), the examiner believes "generated" was intended to be "generalized". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

11. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 17 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,884,309 by Vanechanos, Jr. (Vanechanos).

12. With respect to Claim 1, Vanechanos teaches a method for generalized Common Gateway Interface (CGI) processing (Col. 4 lines 48-53), comprising: (a) providing a plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 5-23, Col. 8 lines 46-52 and See Fig. 3a) on a server connected to a network (Col. 5 lines 59-61); (b) receiving a plurality of distinct user requests over said network (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); and (c) responding to said requests by invoking a single, generalized CGI processing routine for enabling user data corresponding to said plurality of distinct CGI forms to be entered (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4) comprising: (d) generating a parameter file from a selected CGI form corresponding to a user request (Col. 7 lines 28-36); and (e) presenting said selected CGI form on a display device, to collect user input data corresponding to said selected CGI form (Col. 7 lines 20-23 and lines 28-32); (f) presenting said selected CGI form on a display device, to collect user data (Col. 7 lines

20-23 and lines 28-32); and (g) parsing said collected data according to said parameter file to for an output file (Col. 11 lines 19-45).

13. With respect to Claim 3, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and further teaches said step (d) comprising extracting input field names from said selected CGI form (Col. 10 lines 12-15).

14. With respect to Claim 4, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and further teaches reading said user input data based on said parameter file (Col. 11 lines 19-25 and lines 37-39); and formatting said user input data for output to said user (Col. 10 line 64 – Col. 11 line 1).

15. With respect to Claim 5, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 4 and further teaches executing post-processing function to perform additional specified operations on said user input data (Col. 10 lines 49-63); generating an output file including formatted input data and results of said operations (Col. 16 lines 39-51); and reporting a result of said request back to said user (Col. 16 lines 39-51).

16. With respect to Claim 7, Vanechanos teaches a system comprising: a network for transmitting a plurality of user requests to a server (Col. 5 lines 59-61); a server linked to said network (Col. 5 lines 59-61), said server comprising: a plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 5-23, Col. 8 lines 46-52 and See Fig. 3a) corresponding to said requests (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); and generalized handling means for handling each of said plurality of distinct CGI forms in response to said requests (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4), comprising: a single initial data-gathering means for generating a plurality of distinct parameter files from said plurality of distinct

CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 28-36), and a single action means for processing said parameter files and performing user-specified operations corresponding thereto (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 11 lines 19-25 and lines 37-39).

17. With respect to Claim 10, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 7 and further teaches said initial data-gathering means further comprising: means for retrieving said distinct CGI forms from said server in response to said requests; and means for presenting said distinct CGI forms to a user and accepting corresponding user input data (Col. 7 lines 20-23 and lines 28-32).

18. With respect to Claim 11, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 10 and further teaches said action means further comprising: means for reading said user input data based on said parameter files (Col. 11 lines 19-25 and lines 37-39); means for formatting said user input data (Col. 10 line 64 – Col. 11 line 1); means for calling post-processing functions to perform additional specified operations on said user input data (Col. 10 lines 48-63; means for generating an output file including formatted input data and results of said operations (Col. 16 lines 39-51); and means for reporting a result of a request back to a user (Col. 16 lines 39-51).

2. With respect to Claim 13, Vanechanos teaches in a network linking issuers of requests to a server (Col. 5 lines 59-61) comprising a plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 5-23, Col. 8 lines 46-52 and See Fig. 3a), a method comprising: (a) in response to a first request, retrieving a first CGI form from said server and presenting said first CGI form to an issuer of said first request (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); (b) accepting first input data based on said first CGI form and sending said first input data

to said server (Col. 9 lines 54-61); (c) in response to a second request, retrieving a second CGI form different from said first CGI form from said server, and presenting said second CGI form to an issuer of said second request (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); (d) accepting second input data based on said second CGI form and sending said second input data to said server (Col. 9 lines 54-61); and (e) using a single CGI form handling program of said server for processing both said first and second CGI forms and first and second input data (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4).

3. With respect to Claim 17, Vanechanos teaches a computer program product tangibly embodied on a computer-usable medium, said computer program product comprising computer-executable instructions which when executed implement a process comprising: (a) providing a plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 5-23, Col. 8 lines 46-52 and See Fig. 3a) on a server connected to a network (Col. 5 lines 59-61); (b) receiving a plurality of distinct user requests over said network (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); and (c) responding to said requests by invoking a single, generalized CGI processing routine for enabling user data corresponding to said plurality of distinct CGI forms to be entered (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4); (d) presenting said selected CGI form on a display device, to collect user input data corresponding to said selected CGI form (Col. 7 lines 20-23 and lines 28-32); (e) generating a parameter file from a selected CGI form corresponding to a user request (Col. 7 lines 28-36); and (f) generating an output file using said parameter file and input data using said single generated CGI processing routine (Col. 11 lines 19-45).

4. With respect to Claim 19, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 17 and further teaches executing post-processing function to perform additional specified operations on said user input data (Col. 10 lines 49-63); generating an output file including formatted input data and results of said operations (Col. 16 lines 39-51); and reporting a result of said request back to said user (Col. 16 lines 39-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

20. Claims 6, 12, 14-16 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanechanos in view of "FormRunner! Documentation" by Wintergreen Associates, from the June 10, 1998 Internet archive of www.formrunner.com (FormRunner).

21. With respect to Claim 6, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 5 and further teaches said post-processing functions include calculations based on said user input (Col. 16 lines 39-51) and transmitting an output file to a targeted user (Col. 17 lines 54-60 and Col. 6 lines 6-9). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose transmitting by dispatching electronic mail. FormRunner teaches the ability to send formatted form data through electronic mail (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section, specifically Items 3-7 and the last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the method further comprises

dispatching electronic mail transmitting said output file to a targeted user. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for being able to provide customized responses to form processing (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section in FormRunner, 1st paragraph after '9').

22. With respect to Claim 12, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 11 and further teaches said post-processing functions include calculations based on said user input (Col. 16 lines 39-51) and transmitting an output file to a targeted user (Col. 17 lines 54-60 and Col. 6 lines 6-9). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose transmitting by dispatching electronic mail. FormRunner teaches the ability to send formatted form data through electronic mail (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section, specifically Items 3-7 and the last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the system further comprises dispatching electronic mail transmitting said output file to a targeted user. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for being able to provide customized responses to form processing (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section in FormRunner, 1st paragraph after '9').

23. With respect to Claim 14, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 13 and further teaches step (e) comprising: executing the same initial data gathering routine for each of said first and second requests (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4), said initial data gathering routine comprising the steps of: generating a parameter file that has the input fields of a corresponding CGI form (Col. 7 lines 28-36); displaying the

corresponding CGI form on a display device (Col. 7 lines 20-23 and lines 28-32); and generating a submitted CGI form by recording inputs to said corresponding CGI form via said display device (Col. 9 lines 54-61). Vanechanos generally teaches the data patterns received from a submitted form will be compared against the parameter file containing the input fields of the form to determine which fields to process (Col. 4 lines 21-25 and see Claim 3). In this manner, a single, maintainable CGI program can be implemented (Col. 4 line 48 – Col. 5 line 4). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose parsing input fields of the form to generate the parameter file. However, FormRunner shows a form can be parsed to determine the input fields (Section 2.3 on Page 7 of Section 2 – Item number 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method of Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the method further comprises parsing input fields in the corresponding CGI form to generate a parameter file. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for a highly maintainable CGI program that can efficiently interface with multiple web server applications (Col. 4 lines 6-9 of Vanechanos).

24. With respect to Claim 15, Vanechanos in view of FormRunner teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches said step (e) further comprising: following said initial data gathering routine, executing the same data processing routine for each of said first and second requests (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4 of Vanechanos), said data processing routine comprising the steps of: (f) reading said parameter file to determine which fields of said submitted CGI form to process (Col. 11 lines 19-24 and lines 37-39 of Vanechanos); (g) formatting data in fields determined

according to step (f) (Col. 14 lines 57-64 of Vanechanos); and (h) returning a result of said request to an issuer of said request (Col. 15 lines 37-42 and Col. 16 lines 3-52 of Vanechanos).

25. With respect to Claim 16, Vanechanos in view of FormRunner teaches all the limitations of Claim 5. Vanechanos further teaches executing a post-processing program, said post-processing program performing operations on said inputs (Col. 16 lines 39-51) and sending an output file generated by said post-processing program to a target recipient (Col. 17 lines 54-60 and Col. 6 lines 6-9). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose sending the output file to an electronic mail address. FormRunner teaches the ability to send formatted form data to the electronic mail address of a target recepient (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section, specifically Items 3-7 and the last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the method further comprises sending an output file generated by said post-processing program to an electronic mail address of a target recipient. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for being able to provide customized responses to form processing (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section in FormRunner, 1st paragraph after '9').

26. With respect to Claim 20, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 19 and further teaches said post-processing functions include calculations based on said user input (Col. 16 lines 39-51) and transmitting an output file to a targeted user (Col. 17 lines 54-60 and Col. 6 lines 6-9). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose transmitting

by dispatching electronic mail. FormRunner teaches the ability to send formatted form data through electronic mail (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section, specifically Items 3-7 and the last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the program-product disclosed by Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the program-product further comprises dispatching electronic mail transmitting said output file to a targeted user. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for being able to provide customized responses to form processing (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section in FormRunner, 1st paragraph after '9').

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments filed 11/01/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

28. Applicant's state on page 8 of the remarks - "*The generalized CGI handler has an initial prompting part, i.e., gathering program, GNCGI, as well as an action part, GNCGIB. The action (or return response) part is generated based on parameters assigned by the creator of the application. As set forth in the amended claims, once the gathering operation has commenced, the parameter file is used by the action part to parse the data which is received from the user. The CGI handler reads the parameter input and generates the specific appropriate action CGI codes.*"

a. The examiner notes that the claims do not set forth such limitations. The claimed subject matter does not distinguish between a "gathering program" or an "action part" as described. The claims also do not explicitly describe a CGI handler necessarily performing the stated functions. For example, Claim 1 states

a "generalized CGI processing routine" which may include a CGI handler but is broad in scope and may be interpreted as including other processes. Claim 7 only states "generalized handling means" which is also broad in scope and may be interpreted as including other processes. Claim 17 invokes a "generalized CGI processing routine" and makes use of this routine in generating the output file in step (g), but does not specify this routine being necessarily used in the other steps of the claimed subject matter. Furthermore, the claims do not describe generation of "specific appropriate action CGI codes".

29. Applicant's argue on page 9 of the remarks - "*The cited reference, on the other hand, provides only a repository of pre-set, developed action codes, which are retrieved once the CGI search engine determines what parameters are being passed from the user. The CGI doesn't generate any action, but merely calls up a particular stored program for the given application.*"

b. Again, the claims do not specify generation of any "action codes". Furthermore, Applicant's do not provide and any factual evidence in support of this statement. For example, where in Vanechanos is there a teaching of providing only a repository of pre-set, developed action codes.

30. Applicant's argue on page 9 of the remarks - "*Applicant's claims have been amended in a way to distinguish them from the cited art. For instance, in claim 1 it is clear that the parsing of the collected data, according to the parameter file, forms an output file. This structure is now in amended claim 7 and claim 17.*"

c. The examiner notes that Claim 7 does not include structure relating to "parsing of the collected data, according to the parameter file" to form an output file.

31. Applicant's argue on page 9 of the remarks - "*Original claim 13,...also as originally filed makes it clear that a single CGI form handling program is used for first and second CGI forms. The features of being able to accept the first input data from a first form and a second from a second form using a single CGI handling program (as opposed to a stored group of such programs) is not disclosed in the cited reference.*"

d. Applicant's provide no factual evidence as to the cited reference disclosing a "stored group of such programs" for the handling of the form. It is made explicitly clear by Vanechanos that a single CGI program is used in processing multiple, distinctly different forms. Col. 7, lines 5-23, discloses in part that there can be multiple forms that are each unique to a particular entity. The entities are merchants in the explanation of the primary embodiment, but note the CGI program may be used in other systems (Col. 20 lines 44-50). A user accesses a merchant's form by indicating a parameter term in the initial request (Col. Lines 11-25). The end result is you have multiple forms depending on the number of merchants which can all be accessed by multiple users (Col. 10 lines 44-48). Furthermore, the handling and processing of each request and each form is done by a single CGI program. This is clearly expressed in Col. 4, lines 48-53, which states, "In another aspect, the present invention comprises a web server system

and method, in which the software includes a single CGI program for HTML forms transactions..." (emphasis added). As such, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

32. The remaining arguments with respect to Claim 14 and 15 (pages 9-10 or the remarks) are merely conclusive statements that the cited references fail to disclose any of the discussed features. Applicant provides no evidence to support such statements or to rebut the case of obviousness for these claims. As such, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

33. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

34. U.S. Patent 5,875,332 by Wang et al. "Generating a common gateway interface adapter customized for a stored procedure" February 23, 1999. Discloses generation of a CGI adapter for a stored procedure based on the arguments of the procedure. The stored procedure is primarily related to database operations.

35. U.S. Patent 5,892,905 by Brandt et al. "Computer apparatus and method for providing a common user interface for software application accessed via the world-wide web" April 6, 1999. Discloses the use of a single and simple CGI module in relation to providing an interface to a plurality of server applications.

36. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 571-272-3986. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Lazaro
April 19, 2005

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100